

To: Vaughn, Stephanie[Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov]
From: Stan Kaczmarek
Sent: Fri 9/27/2013 8:59:39 PM
Subject: Re: RM 10.9, Steep Slope Plan....

Thanks for the replies today. Work is moving ahead. Let's plan to talk on Monday afternoon after you get settled back in.

If it means anything to you, I apologize that it took so long to get many of these items to you. Hopefully they will provide the platform that will allow all of us to move this portion of the project to an agreeable outcome.

Stan Kaczmarek, PE
de maximis, inc.
186 Center Street, Suite 290
Clinton, NJ 08809
(O) (908) 735-9315
(C) (973) 978-9621

>>> On 9/27/2013 at 4:34 PM, in message
<aa5f388bc1d940e59c10e0848d8a3f42@BL2PR09MB017.namprd09.prod.outlook.com>,
"Vaughn, Stephanie" <Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Stan,

We need to discuss the Steep Sloped Areas plan you submitted yesterday. In particular:

1. The current approved design includes:

- 2' dredge cut up to transect 32+00, then dredging to native material north

of that.

- No capping north of transect 32+00 due to slope stability issues

2. Section 4.2.3 of the approved design specifically states that “For the portion of the Removal Area that will not be capped, the majority of the soft sediment overlying the stiffer native sediment will be removed, with a resulting stable slope anticipated.” Section 4.3.1.2 of the design goes on say that the type of dredge bucket being used (with a fixed arm) can effectively remove sediment from the slopes. In other words, this was a known issue going into the removal and the design asserts that dredging will be able to be achieved in this area.

3. The proposed revised plan calls for:

- ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ A 10' offset from where the toe of the slope begins to rise up to the shoreline
- ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ No dredging north of Station 29+00 unless test dredging proves successful
- ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ An attempt at capping from 30+00 to 32+00 even if dredging doesn't occur

These are my primary concerns and questions:

1. We have an approved design based on known conditions. What has changed?
2. The width of the removal area is greater than 50' from Station 29+50 to Station 32+00, so at least some removal should be achievable

in this area. After that, the width starts to trail off – but again, some removal should be achievable.

3. Coring 0365 went down 3.5', then 0366 went down 2.5', and 0368, 0369, and 0481 went down only 1.5' before hitting refusal – this should help guide expectations.

4. I do not understand the “test dredging” concept – either the sediment is removed or it's not. The entire removal area should be dredged, as possible.

I'm out of the office and unavailable Monday morning, but can be reached by phone Monday afternoon if we need to discuss. Bottom line – dredging should be attempted along the entire removal area, as specified in the approved design.

Thanks,

Stephanie